



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/648,507

08/25/2003

Vijay Mital

MSFT-1948/301410.01

4233

41505

7590

05/22/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/648,507 | Applicant(s) MITAL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner MARK A. X RADTKE | Art Unit 2165 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARK A. X RADTKE. (3)_____.

(2) Kenneth Eiferman (Applicant's Representative). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: This interview took place after Examiner Radtke consulted with SPE Christian Chace regarding the issues described hereafter. Applicant's Representative presented proposed amendments (see attached). Examiner Radtke informed Applicant's Representative that the proposal appeared to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 101 and noted that the claims add a significant amount of new material that would require further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Christian P. Chace/ SPE, 2165

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required